

REMARKS

These remarks follow the order of the paragraphs of the office action. Relevant portions of the office action are shown indented and italicized.

DETAILED ACTION

1. *This is a Non-Final rejection in response to Election/Restriction filed on 05-05-2007 and RCE filed 0 1-30-2007.*
2. *Claims 1-20 are pending.*
3. *Applicants elected invention I, without traverse, which corresponds to claims 1-5, 8-16, and 18-20 are currently pending, and withdrawn claims 6, 7, and 17 in this application. Claims 1, 8 and 12 are independent claims.*
4. *Effective filing date is 03-24-2004, priority date 03-28-2003 (Assignee IBM).*

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

5. *A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 01-30-2007 has been entered.*

Claim Rejections -35 USC § 103

6. *The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:*

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, (I)the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-5, 8-16, and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maeda et al. US 20010054049A1 filed 12-19-2000 (hereinafter Maeda), in view of Chen et al. US 20020078097A1 filed 04-18-2001 (hereinafter Chen).

In response, the applicants respectfully state that continued exception is taken with the so called equivalency of Maeda and Chen and the elements in Claims 1-5, 8-16, and 18-20. The present invention in Claims 1-5, 8-16, and 18-20, are apparently not made obvious by Maeda and Chen.

Applicants respectfully state that in reviewing the office communication it is apparent that although the Examiner rejects all the claims, the statements of the office communication actually can be deemed to support the novelty of the present invention as claimed over Maeda and Chen, the cited reference.

The rejections are apparently based primarily on statements, indicating that although Maeda and Chen don't do (or allude to) the particular claim element, "it would be obvious" to do the particular claim element. Sometimes the clear words of the claim element are redefined in the office communication and construed such as to allegedly put it into a part of Maeda and/or Chen and subsequently support a rejection.

Applicants believe that the "it is obvious" is a result of possible hindsight in an effort to form elements of the claims of the present invention that have no preexistence. In some claims, it is these elements that make the novelty. The Examiner is asked to support all the "it is obvious" statements and the new way each claim is characterized and construed.

In general, the present invention as claimed provides:

Digest screen display content deciding means selects display elements belonging to respective regions of a document based on display priorities of the display elements, which are obtained by digest screen display priority information creating means, and decides selected display elements as display content of a digest screen under a condition where a total display area does not exceed a required display area. A merging relationship among the regions is set based on layout information for the regions, created by digest screen

region layout information creating means. Display content deciding means decides the display content of a detail screen based on the merging relationship among the regions, and creates a digest of the detail screen based on control information created by control information creating means. Moreover, digest screen display content changing means changes the display content of the digest screen in response to an operation of a user. Thus it provides an information processing apparatus for creating a digest of a document a layout of which is determined. It is also in regard to a digest screen. It is for displaying elements belonging to respective regions of a document based on display priorities of the display elements.

Whereas, the cited art to Maeda, is entitled "Information processing system, proxy server, web page display method, storage medium, and program transmission apparatus.' The Maeda abstract reads:

The present invention provides a means to display the contents of a document using a selected display condition, while preserving the layout of the document. It provides an information processing system comprising: a web browser for displaying a document having a predetermined layout; and a display controller for controlling a method used by the web browser to display the document. The display controller includes: a layout structure analyzer for analyzing the structure of the layout for the document; a region arrangement determiner for dividing a web page under a desired display condition, whereby the contents of the page are displayed in order to display the document in accordance with regions that are allocated and that reflect the structure of the document layout obtained by the layout structure analyzer; and an intra-region contents determiner for determining which contents of the document are to be displayed inside each of the allocated regions that are determined by the region arrangement determiner."

Thus, Maeda is concerned and directed to display the contents of a document using a selected display condition, while preserving the layout of the document. Indeed Maeda has many words and phrases as in the present application, but Maeda does not have, teach or make obvious the invention claimed in Claims 1-5, 8-16, and 18-20. There is no digest or digest screen taught or made obvious by Maeda.

The other cited reference to Chen, is entitled, "System for automatically allocating layout and the allocation method thereof." The Chen abstract reads:

A system for automatically allocating a layout suitable for a web page. The system of the present invention utilizes an editing unit provided with a layout template having a plurality of display areas for inputting data and an integrating unit for integrating display areas that contain data with adjacent display areas that do not contain data. The systems can also include a data unit for providing a plurality of data to input into the display areas, a previewing unit with an integrated layout, and a memory unit for storing the integrated layout. The integration unit determines whether display areas adjacent to a selected display area contain data. If not, the display areas are merged.

Thus Chen is concerned and directed to allocating a layout suitable for a web page based on a layout template. Chen is not concerned with display of contents of a document using a selected display condition, while preserving the layout of the document, as is Maeda, so there is no reason for one skilled in the art to combine Chen with Maeda, except in an attempt to find elements of the present claims employing hindsight.

Chen is apparently certainly not concerned with creating a digest of a document a layout of which is determined. It is for displaying elements belonging to respective regions of a document based on display priorities of the display elements, as in Claims 1-5, 8-16, and 18-20. There is apparently no reason for one skilled in the art to combine Maeda with Chen to make Claims 1-5, 8-16, and 18-20 obvious. Besides, there is no digest or digest screen taught or made obvious by Chen either. Even the combination doesn't teach, allude to or make Claims 1-5, 8-16, and 18-20 obvious. Thus Claims 1-5, 8-16, and 18-20 are allowable over the combination of references.

The office communication states:

Regarding independent claim 1, Maeda teaches:

An information processing apparatus comprising means for creating a digest of a document a layout of which is determined, when said layout being too large to fit in a display screen of a display device or when a document reader requires said document to be zoomed for reading characters displayed on the display device, the document including a plurality of regions, each region including one or more display elements, the means for creating comprising:

(See Maeda fig. 1 and para 13-15, discloses an information processing terminal, includes web browser, and display controller (for analyzing the structure of the layout of the document, a region arrangement) to display the contents of a document using a

selected display condition, such as a desired font size or a desired line space or character space, while preserving the layout of the document as well as to edit the contents of the document, when it is enlarged and displayed, so that important information in the document survives.

Applicants respectfully state that continued exception is taken with the so called equivalency and/or teaching of Maeda and Chen and the elements in Claim 1. *Claim 1 reads:*

1. An information processing apparatus comprising means for creating a digest of a document a layout of which is determined, when said layout being too large to fit in a display screen of a display device or when a document reader requires said document to be zoomed for reading characters displayed on the display device, the document including a plurality of regions, each region including one or more display elements, the means for creating comprising:

means for selecting the display elements based on display priorities of the display elements, and for deciding all of selected display elements as a display content of a digest screen under a condition where a total display area of all of the selected display elements does not exceed a required display area;

means for setting a merging relationship among the regions by deciding a merging region, with which a region not being displayed on the digest screen is merged, from among regions displayed on the digest screen based on layout information for the regions in the document, all of the regions being included in the document; and

means for ensuring access to information lost by creating the digest and ensuring said digest fits optimally on said display device.

The referenced portion of Maeda fails to support the allegation in the office communication above, that Maeda teaches

An information processing apparatus comprising means for creating a digest of a document a layout of which is determined, when said layout being too large to fit in a display screen of a display device or when a document reader requires said document to be zoomed for reading characters displayed on the display device, the document including a plurality of regions, each region including one or more display elements, the means for creating comprising

in Maeda fig. 1 and para 13-15. Maeda para 13-15 reads:

[0013] In order to resolve the above shortcomings, it is one aspect of the present invention to display the contents of a document using a selected display condition, such as a desired font size or a desired line space or character space, while preserving the layout of the document.

[0014] It is another aspect of the present invention to edit the contents of the document, when it is enlarged and displayed, so that important information in the document survives.

[0015] To achieve the above aspects of the invention, an information processing system comprises: document display means for displaying a document having a predetermined layout; and display control means for controlling a method used by the document display means to display the document. The display control means include a layout structure analyzer for analyzing the structure of the layout of the document, a region arrangement determiner for dividing a web page, under a desired display condition whereby the contents of the page are displayed, in order to display the document in accordance with regions that are allocated and that reflect the structure of the document layout that is obtained by the layout structure analyzer, and an intra-region contents determiner for determining which contents of the document are to be displayed inside each of the allocated regions that are determined by the region arrangement determiner.

In the above paragraphs, Maeda is concerned with a document having a predetermined layout, a layout structure analyzer and determining which contents of the document are to be displayed inside each of the allocated regions that are determined by a region analyzer. There is no allusion to, or even a concern with:

- a document digest;
- creating a digest of a document;
- a layout of a document digest;
- determining a layout of a document digest;
- a digest layout being too large to fit in a display screen of a display device;
- zooming a document;
- reading character;
- any document reader requiring a document to be zoomed for reading characters displayed on the display device,;
- means for creating a digest.

as in claim 1. The office communication continues:

Also, see Maeda para 89, disclose the web browser 10 that employs the DOM tree automatically converts the HTML document into the tree, the obtained tree structure is merely be fetched by the layout structure analyzer 21.

*Using the broadest reasonable interpretation, the examiner reads the claimed **creating a digest of a document** as equivalent to analyzing the structure of the layout of the document, a region arrangement as taught by Maeda, and also see applicants' current disclosure at para 6, "method for creating a digest of the web page, in which a layout of the Web page is automatically analyzed based on tags of an HTML (refer to Patent Document 1),")*

Exception is taken with the office communication allegation that **creating a digest of a document** is equivalent to analyzing the structure of the layout of the document. Analyzing a Web page has no known relationship to creating a digest of a document. **Creating a digest of a document** is not , a region arrangement as taught by Maeda.

The office communication statement that applicants' current disclosure at para 6, "method for creating a digest of the web page, in which a layout of the Web page is automatically analyzed based on tags of an HTML (refer to Patent Document 1),"), shows no equivalence of creating a digest with analyzing. The 'in which' statement does not support the office communication allegation. "In which" does not define digest or a method of creating a digest. It means just what it says. It just says what is in it. There is no concern with a digest or digest screen in the cited art. Thus, the referenced portion of Maeda and the cited portion of the present specification indeed fails to support the allegation in the office communication above, that Maeda teaches a digest, or creating a digest.

means for selecting the display elements based on display priorities of the display elements, and for deciding all of selected display elements as a display content of a digest screen under a condition where a total display area of all of the selected display elements does not exceed a required display area;

(See Maeda para 106, provides means to display the contents of a document using a selected display condition.

Also, see Maeda Fig. 15 and para 118, displaying all the characters in "chapter 1," which is the most important, in the contents of the HTML tag <H1> of the target node,

Also, see Maeda Fig. 16 and para 119, displaying "chapter 1" and "chapter 2," which are the most important contents of the HTML tags <H1> of the two target nodes,

Also, see Maeda Fig. 18 and para 121, showing nodes that are currently established as assigned regions, and the rectangular areas that are represented by the nodes. By referring to FIG. 18, the layout of the web page is determined using three

assigned regions,

Also, see Maeda para 81, discloses the elements wherein a display condition designated by a user. As a result, there is no deterioration of the layout of the web page.

Also, see Maeda fig. 1 and para 13-15, discloses an information processing terminal, includes web browser, and display controller (for analyzing the structure of the layout of the document, a region arrangement) to display the contents of a document using a selected display condition, such as a desired font size or a desired line space or character space, while preserving the layout of the document as well as to edit the contents of the document, when it is enlarged and displayed, so that important information in the document survives. Using broadest reasonable interpretation, the examiner equates the claimed condition where a total display area of all of the selected display elements does not exceed a required display area as equivalent to display controller (for analyzing the structure of the layout of the document, a region arrangement) to display the contents of a document using a selected display condition, such as a desired font size or a desired line space or character space, while preserving the layout of the document, and Fig. 15-18 as taught by Maeda.)

and means for ensuring access to information lost by creating the digest and ensuring said digest fits optimally on said display device.

(See Maeda fig. 1 and para 13-15, discloses an information processing terminal, includes web browser, and display controller (for analyzing the structure of the layout of the document, a region arrangement) to display the contents of a document using a selected display condition, such as a desired font size or a desired line space or character space, while preserving the layout of the document as well as to edit the contents of the document, when it is enlarged and displayed, so that important information in the document survives.

Also, see Maeda para 81, discloses the elements wherein a display condition designated by a user. As a result, there is no deterioration of the layout of the web page.)

Applicants fail to see the point allegedly made by the office communication in the above referenced portions of Maeda. In the above referenced paragraphs, Maeda is concerned with things as preserving a layout, a document having a predetermined layout, a layout structure analyzer and determining which contents of the document are to be displayed inside each of the allocated regions that are determined by a region analyzer.

For example, the referenced portion of Maeda reads:

[0081] The display controller 20 controls the display of the web page by the web browser 10. Specifically, the elements, such as characters and images, that constitute the web page are displayed based on a display condition designated by a user, regardless of the original display condition provided for the pertinent web page, i.e., the display condition designated by the producer of the pertinent web page. The display condition here includes

the font size, the line spacing or the character spacing. To display the web page, the web page is divided into several blocks, the locations and the sizes of the blocks are fixed, and only the display condition of the elements is changed. As a result, there is no deterioration of the layout of the web page.

There is no allusion to, or even a concern with:

access to information lost;
creating a digest;
ensuring that a digest fits on a display device.

There is no obviousness of these means of claim 1.

In addition, Maeda does not explicitly teach, but Chen teaches:

means for setting a merging relationship among the regions by deciding a merging region, with which a region not being displayed on the digest screen is merged, from among regions displayed on the digest screen based on layout information for the regions in the document, all of the regions being included in the document;

(See Chen fig. 3, 4a-c and para 10-15, shows the merging process, wherein the first display area is merging with the second display area if the second display area does not contain data an intermediate data stream in name/value pair format; determining whether a third display area adjacent to the first display area in the vertical direction contains data; and determining whether a third display area adjacent to the first display area in the vertical direction contains data; and merging the first display area with the third display area if the second display area does not contain data.

*Also, see Chen para 36-5 1; disclose the details of the merging process of Fig. 3, and Fig. 4a-c. Using the broadest reasonable interpretation, it is noted the claimed **the digest screen is merged** is the merging process (see fig. 3, 4a-c) as taught by Chen.*

There is no allusion in Chen to, or even a concern with, merging a digest screen. Chen's merging is based on merging display areas when display areas adjacent to a selected display area contain data. If not, the display areas are merged. This has no relevance to the merging of a digest screen.

The office communication states further:

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Maeda's information processing terminal, provides a means to display the contents of a document using a selected display condition, while preserving the layout of the document, to include a means of setting a merging relationship among the regions by deciding a merging region, with which a region not being displayed on the digest screen is merged, from among regions displayed on the digest screen based on layout information for the regions in the document, all of the

regions being included in the document as taught by Chen. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification, because Maeda and Chen are analogous art, since they are from the same field of allocating, and merging lay out of web document without deterioration of the layout of the web page, and provides the followings advantages: The contents of a document can be displayed in accordance with a desired display condition (font size, line spacing, character spacing, etc.), while the layout of the document is preserved; Further, when characters are enlarged and displayed while the layout is being preserved, the display contents can be edited without important information in the document being erased (see Maeda para 162-163).

Applicants hold that there indeed fails to see that it

would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Maeda's information processing terminal, provides a means to display the contents of a document using a selected display condition, while preserving the layout of the document, to include a means of setting a merging relationship among the regions by deciding a merging region, with which a region not being displayed on the digest screen is merged, from among regions displayed on the digest screen based on layout information for the regions in the document, all of the regions being included in the document as taught by Chen. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification, because Maeda and Chen are analogous art, since they are from the same field of allocating, and merging lay out of web document without deterioration of the layout of the web page,

Chen's merging has no relationship to the alleged merging of the office communication to make claim 1 obvious.

The large array of referenced portion of Maeda even with Chen, fails to support the allegation in the office communication above, that Maeda with or without Chen teaches or alludes to:

means for selecting the display elements based on display priorities of the display elements, and for deciding all of selected display elements as a display content of a digest screen under a condition where a total display area of all of the selected display elements does not exceed a required display area;

A review of Maeda apparently shows that Maeda fails to teach or make obvious the means of claim 1. Although, Maeda refers to priority order and priority listing for Maeda's own purposes and use. Maeda is not concerned with:

display priorities;

display elements;

means for selecting the display elements based on display priorities of the display elements;

a digest screen;

display of a digest screen;
deciding display elements as content of a digest screen;
any condition where a total display area of all of the selected display elements does not exceed a required display area; or
deciding all of selected display elements as a display content of a digest screen under a condition where a total display area of all of the selected display elements does not exceed a required display area.

The large array of referenced portion of Maeda even with Chen, fails to support the allegation in the office communication above, that Maeda with or without Chen teaches or alludes to:

means for setting a merging relationship among the regions by deciding a merging region, with which a region not being displayed on the digest screen is merged, from among regions displayed on the digest screen based on layout information for the regions in the document, all of the regions being included in the document;

A review of Maeda and Chen apparently shows that Maeda and Chen fail to teach or make obvious the means of claim 1. Although, Chen refers to merging. Maeda together with Chen are not concerned with:

**any merging relationship;
any merging relationship among the regions;
deciding any merging region;
merging any region not being displayed on the digest screen;
merging of a display on a digest screen;
merging based on layout information;
merging based on layout information for regions in a document;
inclusion of all of regions being included in a document;
means for setting a merging relationship among regions;
a merging relationship for a region not being displayed on a digest screen;
regions displayed on a digest screen based on layout information.**

Thus, the combination fails to allude to, teach or make obvious claim. Thus, claim 1 and all claims dependent on claim 1 are allowable over the cited art

Regarding independent claim 8, the rejection of claim 1 is fully incorporated.

In response the applicants respectfully state that indeed as with claim 1 claim 8 and all claims dependent on claim 1 are allowable over the cited art

Regarding independent claim 12:

is directed to a computer program code functioning to perform the method recited in Claim 1 and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

In response the applicants respectfully state that claim 12 is a Beauregard claim not alleged to be made obvious in the cited art. Besides, as with claim 1 claim 12 and all claims dependent on claim 1 are allowable over the cited art

Regarding claims 2-3, Chen teaches:

means for deciding, as a display content of a detail screen, a region group including the regions displayed on the digest screen, further comprising means for creating control information for controlling a display of the detail screen, wherein the means for deciding the display content of the detail screen creates a digest of the detail screen based on the control information when the region group is too large to fit in the required display area.

(See Maeda fig. 1 and para 13-15, discloses an information processing terminal, includes web browser, and display controller (for analyzing the structure of the layout of the document, a region arrangement) to display the contents of a document using a selected display condition, such as a desired font size or a desired line space or character space, while preserving the layout of the document as well as to edit the contents of the document, when it is enlarged and displayed, so that important information in the document survives.

Also, see Maeda para 89, disclose the web browser 10 that employs the DOM tree automatically converts the HTML document into the tree, the obtained tree structure is merely be fetched by the layout structure analyzer 21.

Also, see Maeda para 81, discloses the elements wherein a display condition designated by a user. As a result, there is no deterioration of the layout of the web page.)

In addition, Maeda does not explicitly teach, but Chen teaches:

and the region merged with the displayed regions in response to that a detail display of the displayed regions is required,

(See Chen fig. 3, 4a-c and para 10-15, shows the merging process, wherein the first display area is merging with the second display area if the second display area does not contain data an intermediate data stream in name/value pair format; determining whether a third display area adjacent to the first display area in the vertical direction contains data; and determining whether a third display area adjacent to the first display area in the vertical direction contains data; and merging the first display area with the third display area if the second display area does not contain data.

Also, see Chen para 36-5 1; disclose the details of the merging process of Fig. 3, and Fig. 4a-c.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Maeda's information processing terminal, provides a means to display the contents of a document using a selected display condition, while preserving the layout of the document, to include region merged with the displayed regions in response to that a detail display of the displayed regions is required as taught by Chen. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification, because Maeda and Chen are analogous art, since they are from the same field of allocating, and merging lay out of web document without deterioration of the layout of the web page, and provides the followings advantages: The contents of a document can be displayed in accordance with a desired display condition (font size, line spacing, character spacing, etc.), while the layout of the document is preserved; Further, when characters are enlarged and displayed while the layout is being preserved, the display contents can be edited without important information in the document being erased (see Maeda para 162-163).

In response the applicants respectfully state that apparently the combination doesn't make claims 2 and 3 obvious. Claims 2 and 3 read:

2. The information processing apparatus according to claim 1, further comprising means for deciding, as a display content of a detail screen, a region group including the regions displayed on the digest screen and the region merged with the displayed regions in response to that a detail display of the displayed regions is required.
3. The information processing apparatus according to claim 2, further comprising means for creating control information for controlling a display of the detail screen, wherein the means for deciding the display content of the detail screen creates a digest of the detail screen based on the control information when the region group is too large to fit in the required display area.

As shown above there is no reason to combine Chen with Maeda except in using hindsight to try to find a combination that together teach the present invention. Each is directed to a different technology area and are not analogous art. But even the combination fails to teach claim 1 or claims 2 and 3.

It was shown above that Chen's merging is not the merging of the present claims. It merges an area without data. It was shown that the combination is not concerned with a document digest. The combination certainly makes no allusion to a detail screen. Thus the combination, even in the referenced portions above fails to show teaching or concern with:

a detail screen,;
regions displayed on a digest screen;
region merged with a displayed regions in response to a detail display;
control information for controlling a display of a detail screen;
deciding display content of a detail screen
creating a digest of a detail screen;
deciding, as a display content of a detail screen, a region group including the regions displayed on the digest screen and the region merged with the displayed regions in response to that a detail display of the displayed regions is required; or
means for creating control information for controlling a display of the detail screen; or
means for deciding the display content of the detail screen creates a digest of the detail screen based on the control information when the region group is too large to fit in the required display area.

as in claims 2 and 3. Thus claims 2 and 3 are allowable each for itself and because each depends on an allowable claim.

Regarding claim 4, Maeda teaches:

means for changing the display content of the digest screen based on an operation of a user.

(See Maeda para 89, disclose the web browser 10 that employs the DOM tree automatically converts the HTML document into the tree, the obtained tree structure is merely be fetched by the layout structure analyzer 21.

Also, see Maeda para 81, discloses the elements wherein a display condition designated by a user. As a result, there is no deterioration of the layout of the web page.)

In response the applicants respectfully state that apparently the combination doesn't make claim 4 obvious. The combination doesn't teach:

a digest screen;
changing the display content of the digest screen; or
changing based on an operation of a user.

Thus claim 4 is allowable for itself and because it depends on an allowable claim.

Regarding claim 5, Maeda teaches:

the changing means includes means for automatically changing the display content of the digest screen, accompanying the operation of the user.

(See Maeda para 89, disclose the web browser 10 that employs the DOM tree automatically converts the HTML document into the tree, the obtained tree structure is merely be fetched by the layout structure analyzer 21.

Also, see Maeda para 81, discloses the elements wherein a display condition designated by a user. As a result, there is no deterioration of the layout of the web page. Using the broadest reasonable interpretation, it is noted the claimed the display content of the digest screen is the web browser 10 that employs the DOM tree automatically converts the HTML document into the tree, the obtained tree structure is merely be fetched by the layout structure analyzer 21 as taught by Maeda.)

In response the applicants respectfully state that apparently the combination doesn't make claim 5 obvious. The combination doesn't teach:

a digest screen;
changing the display content of a digest screen; or
changing based on an operation of a user.

Thus claim 5 is allowable each for itself and because each depends on an allowable claim.

Regarding claims 9-11 respectively:

the rejection of claims 2-3, and 5 respectively, and are fully incorporated.

In response the applicants respectfully state that ***as with claims 2 and 3, claims 9-11*** are allowable each for itself and because each depends on an allowable claim

Regarding claims 13-15 respectively:

are directed to a computer program code functioning to perform the

method recited in claims 2-3, and 5 respectively, and are similarly rejected along the same rationale.

In response the applicants respectfully state that claims 13-15 are Beauregard claims not made obvious by the combined art. Thus claims 13-15 are allowable each for itself and because each depends on an allowable claim

Regarding claim 16:

is directed to a computer program product comprising a computer usable medium having computer readable program code embedded therein to perform the method recited in claim 1, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale (See Maeda para 164, discloses hardware, software, or a combination of hardware and software. And also be embedded in a computer program product.)

In response the applicants respectfully state that claim 16 is a Beauregard claim not made obvious by the combined art. Thus claim 16 is allowable for itself and because it depends on an allowable claim

Regarding claim 18:

is directed to an article of manufacture comprising a computer usable medium having computer readable program code means embodied therein to perform the method recited in claim 8, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale (See Maeda para 164, discloses hardware, software, or a combination of hardware and software. And also be embedded in a computer program product.)

In response the applicants respectfully state that claim 18 is a Beauregard claim not made obvious by the combined art. Thus claim 18 is allowable for itself and because it depends on an allowable claim

Regarding claim 19:

is directed to program storage device readable by machine, tangibly embodying a program of instructions executable by the machine to perform the method recited in claim 8, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale (See Maeda para 164, discloses hardware, software, or a combination of hardware and software. And also be embedded in a computer program product.)

In response the applicants respectfully state that claim 19 is a Beauregard claim not made obvious by the combined art. Thus claim 19 is allowable for itself and because it depends on an allowable claim

*Regarding claim 20:
the rejections of claims 1-5 are fully incorporated, and is similarly
rejected along the same rational.*

In response the applicants respectfully state that claim 20 is a detailed claim. It protects a particular embodiment of the present invention. Claim 20 reads:

20. The information processing apparatus according to claim 1, further comprising at least one limitation taken from a group of limitations consisting of:

means for deciding, as a display content of a detail screen, a region group including regions displayed on a digest screen and a region merged with displayed regions in response to a detail display of the displayed regions is required;

means for creating control information for controlling a display of the detail screen, wherein the means for deciding the display content of the detail screen creates a digest of the detail screen based on the control information when the region group is too large to fit in the required display area;

wherein the means for deciding the display content of the digest screen further includes means for changing the display content of the digest screen based on an operation of a user;

wherein the changing means includes means for automatically changing the display content of the digest screen, accompanying the operation of the user;

means for transmitting information for creating the digest of the document the layout of which is determined to a client terminal together with the document;

means for obtaining display priorities of a plurality of display elements belonging to each of a plurality of regions of the document based on attributes of the display elements;
means for creating layout information for the regions in the document; and

means for dividing the ratio of the cumulative length by a significance of the region to which the display element belongs, the ratio having been obtained for each of the display elements.

It is anticipated that this amendment shows that claims 1-20 are allowable. If any question remains, please contact the undersigned before issuing a communication with a FINAL status. Please charge any fee necessary to enter this paper to deposit account 50-0510.

By: /Louis Herzberg/
Dr. Louis P. Herzberg
Reg. No. 41,500
Voice Tel. (845) 352-3194
Fax. (845) 352-3194

3 Cloverdale Lane
Monsey, NY 10952
Customer Number: 54856